Smuggling Bowles Past the Senate, P. 3

Chief Justice Warren Vividly Depicts the Widespread Abuses of Moving Picture Censorship, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 4 JANUARY 30, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

If Only John F. Kennedy Were in Hans Christian Andersen

The new President and the lovely new young First Lady are as charming as any Prince and Princess out of a childhood book of fairy tales. How could one's heart help but warm to them and to wish them well? There is a divinity that doth hedge Presidents as well as Kings, and there must be few of us who do not hope deep down that by some magic this new monarch's wand will wave away our ills. The primitive superstition close beneath the surface of our selves suffuses the beginning of a new reign or Administration with an almost religious festivity; the bands play, the troops march; past errors are wiped away, the country is reborn for a fresh start.

Eight years ago the country could place its reliance on the father image of an old soldier. Now our talisman is a youthful St. George, who can slay the dragon or charm him away. The mood was deepened by the brisk but elevated tone, the brief but comprehensive sweep, of his inaugural message, above all by the unmistakable zest of his "I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it." And there he was —the eager beaver—at the White House early and on time next morning, fresh after only a few hours sleep, a young man determined to make good in a new job. He didn't even take his Sunday off. This young man should go far. After a part-time President, away on sick leave or vacation much of the time, this *was* a change.

Something for Everybody

In the euphoric post-inaugural atmosphere sober reflection seems sacrilegious. Right and left, there is applause for the inaugural address. How could it please such diverse people? The secret lies both in the new President and in ourselves. The inaugural message had something in it for everybody. At one point it seemed to promise a step up in the cold war, at another an intensified search for peace. At one point there was cheer for those who want greater arms expenditures—"only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt" (more billions?) "can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." But the very next paragraph offered cheer to the advocates of disarmament—"both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war." But how can arms be made sufficient beyond doubt when both sides are racing to alter an uncertain balance of terror? Logically these propositions cancel each other out. But each of us assumes that the proposition with which we disagree was put in as eyewash for our adversaries. So wishful thinking shuts off the inner ear, and it does not register what we do not wish to hear.

A Master of Razzle-Dazzle

A little sleight-of-hand, a certain modicum of chicanery, are inseparable from the governance of men. Mr. Kennedy was after all the nominee of the Democratic party; he was not elected by acclamation at a convention of idealists and pacifists; he must keep very disparate elements happy, though perhaps only happily deceived, if he is to achieve a sufficient common denominator in the party and the country for effective action. He is a President, not a dictator, and any man as either is still a prisoner of the habitual; men can only be moved a little way beyond the familiar. Mr. Kennedy gives every indication of being the greatest master of manipulative politics since FDR, no mean man at razzle-dazzle. It is a necessary quality, and we must be patient. But in being patient there is no reason to shut our eyes to realities. Mr. Kennedy, for all his activism, seems to be a rather cautious perhaps even conventional man. He will grow; he reads; he can be reached; he has potentials of sympathy and of vision. But at the outset of his Administration the key posts are occupied by much the same types representing much the same forces as under Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. Kennedy as a politician in his dealings with Congress, the military bureaucracy and the moneyed powers of the country instinctively looks for the winning combination, the line of least resistance. This is not good enough to cope with an increasingly unstable world, long and ludicrously outgrown its nation-state diapers, menaced by the religious fanaticism of competing, oversimplified and delusive ideologies. Only unconventional measures can possibly get mankind away from the brink.

What Sacrifices? By Whom?

To see how little signs there are of these unconventional measures one has only to ask what was the meaning of Mr. Kennedy's declaration that "We shall pay any price . . . to assure the survival and the success of liberty." Does this mean that we are prepared to pay the price of giving up sugar, banana or oil interests in Latin America to show our neighbors how they can end poverty within the framework of a free society? Above all are we ready to pay the price of adopting those wide measures of social reconstruction to replace the arms race and save liberty from the garrison state? Or will we find ourselves ultimately asked to bear the burden of piling up more arms in the fallacious search for that new delusion, a balanced nuclear deterrent?

This had to be written to reach the printer by noon Wednesday, Jan. 25. At press time, after the President's superb first press conference, we begin again to hope. A new tone is unmistakable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Framers Would Have Found This Ruling Stranger Even Than Talking Pictures

Supreme Court, 5-to-4, Reconciles Movie Censorship With 1st Amendment

Nine years ago a unanimous Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Clark, held that freedom of expression in the moving pictures was protected by the First Amendment. It ruled that New York's censors were wrong in banning Rosellini's great film, "The Miracle" as sacrilegious. Now, in an appeal from the banning of "Don Juan" in Chicago, Mr. Justice Clark in a 5-to-4 decision holds that moving pictures, though protected by the First Amendment, may lawfully be subjected to prior censorship. The idea that censorship could somehow—and might some day—be reconciled with the First Amendment would have seemed stranger than talking motion pictures to the framers of the Bill of Rights.

A Clear Cut Test Case

Mr. Justice Clark is careful to circumscribe his ruling. "We are dealing," he says, "only with motion pictures and even as to them only in the context . . . presented in this record." The appeal did not attack the specific regulations under which the Chicago police censor films. It presented no evidence as to whether "Don Juan" was obscene or immoral. The Court was asked to say that movie censorship *under any circumstances was improper.* This is what Clark, Frankfurter, Harlan, Whittaker and Stewart refused to say.

Philosophically, this creates a serious fissure in the dike of the First Amendment. There may have been difficulty from the first in reconciling laws against libel and obscenity with the First Amendment's absolute bar against abridging freedom of speech and press, but no one then ever dreamt it could be interpreted to include censorship. The battle against censorship had been won long before our Revolution—in England by 1695 and in the Colonies by 1725. The majority by acquiescing in a police practice which has grown up with the movie industry, endangers other forms of expression. The evil precedent might some day be extended.

Practically, the decision will encourage gross abuses. These, as may be seen in the box below from the dissent by the Chief Justice, are widespread. If censorship were outlawed, the police would be compelled to use criminal statutes against obscene performances to punish the showing of improper films. The need to go into court would make it difficult to ban movies just because they seemed to carry ideas some policeman thought dangerous. By allowing censorship, the Supreme Court puts the burden on the theatre owner or producer to litigate his way to our highest court if he does not like the cop's ruling. It becomes easier to submit, not only to the cutting of films by the censor but by avoiding controversial ideas in making them.

In two eloquent dissents, one by Warren with Black, Douglas and Brennan, the other by Douglas with Warren and Black, the minority argues both the practical and the classic case for freedom from censorship, citing its great champions from Milton to Galsworthy. But I fear they will arouse little echo in the country. Freedom has become an item of export, something we broadcast over Radio Free Europe. At home most of us are content to let the cops tell us what movies we can see.

On Djilas and Mme. Ivinskaya

We welcome the release from prison in Yugoslavia of Djilas and we protest the sentences imposed in Russia on Pasternak's close collaborator, Olga Ivinskaya and her daughter. Djilas, who had the courage to attack the ruling class habits of the party elite, has been released without humiliating recantation and with unbroken spirit. In the Soviet Union, the secret police seem to be taking out on Mme. Ivanskaya the frustration they suffered when Khrushchov shielded Pasternak from them. She has been sentenced to eight years in prison; her daughter to three, on vague charges of currency violation in connection with the royalties on Dr. Zhivago. Pasternak feared they would be persecuted after his death. Mme. Ivinskaya spent three years in a Siberian labor camp under Stalin; the secret police had hoped then to extract a false confession from her which could be used to frame Pasternak. Writers in the West as eminent as Bertrand Russell have appealed to Khrushchov on her behalf. Surely he must realize that the habits of falsification he encountered in agriculture recently may also exist in his police apparatus.

Chief Justice Warren Vividly Depicts the Widespread Abuses of Movie Censorship

"A revelation of the extent to which censorship has recently been used in this country is indeed astonishing. The Chicago licensors have banned newsreel films of Chicago policemen shooting at labor pickets and have ordered the deletion of a scene depicting the birth of a buffalo in Walt Disney's Vanishing Prairie. Before World War II, the Chicago censor denied licenses to a number of films portraying and criticizing life in Nazi Germany. . . .

"The Memphis censors banned The Southerner which dealt with poverty among tenant farmers because 'it reflects on the South.' . . . Maryland censors restricted a Polish documentary film on the basis that it failed to present a true picture of modern Poland. No Way Out, the story of a Negro doctor's struggle against race prejudice, was banned by the Chicago censor on the ground that 'there's a possibility it could cause trouble.' . . . Memphis banned Curley because it contained scenes of white and Negro children in school together. Atlanta barred Lost Boundaries, the story of a Negro physician and his family who 'passed' for white.

"'From Joan of Arc' the Maryland board eliminated Joan's exclamation as she stood at the stake: "Oh God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and from Idiot's Delight the sentence: 'We, the workers of the world, will take care of that.' Professor Mamlock was produced in Russia and portrayed the persecution of the Jews by Nazis. The Ohio censors condemned it as 'harmful.' . . . Spanish Earth, a pro-Loyalist documentary picture, was banned by the board in Pennsylvania. . . . Charlie Chaplin's satire on Hitler, The Great Dictator, was banned in Chicago. . . . Ohio and Kansas barred newsreels considered pro-labor. . . . The New York censors forbade the discussion in films of pregnancy, venereal disease, eugenics, birth control, abortion, illegitimacy, prostitution, miscegenation and divorce. . . . A police sergeant attached to the [Chicago] censor board explained, 'Coarse language or anything that would be derogatory to the government—propaganda' is ruled out of foreign films. 'Nothing pink or red is allowed,' he added. . . .

"This is the regimen to which the Court holds that all films must be submitted."

—Warren dissenting in Times Film v. Chicago, Jan. 23

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Senators On China Policy Resemble China's Own Mandarins in Their Most Foolish Era

Bowles Smuggled Into State Dept. Disguised to Look Like Walter Judd

No ship of state ever sailed through more treacherous waters than ours in dealing with the China question, and none ever found patriots so eager to lock the wheel tight. The hearings given Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on their respective appointments as Ambassador to the UN and Under Secretary of State show that China has become an obsession in this capital. Indeed it deserves to be, since the re-emergence of China as a world power will affect the lives of our children and the future of our country far more drastically than did the Russian Revolution. The latter will seem by comparison a distant event. It would have been normal for almost all the questioning to center around China policy, if the dominant theme of the anxious queries was not to make sure that both men were safely rigid in the fixed folly of non-recognition and non-negotiation. Except for a few questions put by Senator Symington (see box below) at the end of the long session with Mr. Bowles, the driving force of the interrogation was to make sure that neither of these men had any fresh ideas on the subject or would dare broach them if they had. Our Senators must resemble China's Mandarins in those eras like the Nineteenth Century when they most seriously misjudged the Middle Kingdom's relations with the outer barbarians whom they saw no need to recognize.

Sniffing for Heresy

Those who read the transcripts for themselves (they are available from the Committee in printed form) will be amazed to see how little was asked or said about Cuba, the Congo, Laos, nuclear testing or Berlin. The atmosphere resembled that of a heresy tribunal designed to sniff out any unorthodoxy on the sacred dogma that keeps us subject to Chiang Kai-shek's anachronistic delusions on Formosa. Mr. Bowles, though suspect, was saved from condemnation by skillful party cooperation. He was flatteringly introduced by the rightist Dodd of Connecticut, as if thus to confer upon him innocence by association. Senator Sparkman then spiked Republican guns by a series of loaded questions designed to show that Mr. Bowles was against recognition, sour about negotiation, and unwilling to see Peking admitted to the UN. Providentially, Sparkman was also able to show from Edgar Snow's interview with Chou En-lai in the January 31 issue of *Look* that the Red Chinese Foreign Minister had attacked Mr. Bowles *personally* for advocating a "two Chinas" solution. All this took the wind out of Republican sails and enabled Mr. Bowles to pass muster, hastily disguised to resemble Walter Judd. Such are the stratagems required to smuggle a liberal into a high post at the State Department.

Mr. Bowles was forced to fall back on the view that there is nothing we can do except sit tight for 20 or 30 years until something—just what is not clear—happens in China. The idea that some changes in thinking must take part on our side too was, of course, excluded. In the meantime, he said, we have to find some way to reach the Chinese people. Conspicuous by its absence was any suggestion that the current famine in China might provide an ideal opportunity to do so.

Perhaps the silliest moment in the hearing came when Senator Aiken (*R.Vt.*) said that if the UN recognized a Peking delegation as representing all China including Formosa "It would rip a great hole in our Pacific defenses, leaving Hawaii and the coast of all the Americas open to possible enemy attack across the Pacific."

Covering That War In Laos

"At least there is no hypocrisy about information and censorship in Vientiane. This week [Information] Minister Bouvan reported the Government's interesting charge that Russian troops had joined in the fighting against Royal Laotian forces. There was a stunned silence and then a burst of incredulous laughter from correspondents. The minister was unperturbed. 'Well,' he said reasonably, as he tapped the Government communique, 'That's what it says here'."

—Dispatch from Laos, London Sunday Times, Jan. 15

"Bouvan repeated long-standing Government charges, doubted by most Westerners here, that troops of Communist North Vietnam are aiding the rebels and in fact make up 70 percent of their forces. This time he said new 'proofs' consisted of (1) hearing rebel commands spoken in Vietnamese and (2) discovery of thousands of chopsticks and dog bones in areas where the rebels had camped. Laotians do not use chopsticks and eat dogs; Vietnamese do.

" 'Your excellency,' said a British correspondent, 'you are not serious.'

" 'This is what the Laotian officers told me,' Bouvan replied."

—AP from Vientiane in Baltimore Sun, Jan. 22

Symington Alone at Bowles Hearing Advocates Better Relations With Peking

Senator SYMINGTON (D.Mo): How could there ever be a meaningful arms control agreement, skipping the details, without recognizing in the agreement the people and the government of Red China?

Mr. Chester BOWLES: Well, if we did not take into account the 650 million people of Red China in arriving at any arms control agreement, the joke would be on the rest of the human race. . . .

Senator SYMINGTON: And, therefore, regardless of how much some of us may feel today on either side of this problem, there is not anything really more important in the world today than to do everything we can to improve our relationship with the Chinese Communists; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. BOWLES [hedging]: We must begin by understanding what is there, the enormous power that has been generated there. I understand this is a major factor. One of the most tragic things in the last few years has been the narrowness of our views on this whole question. . . .

Senator SYMINGTON: With the growth of the nuclear club and in the strength of Communist China, it seems to me that, for the first time, the Russians might perhaps now be anxious to work out something that is meaningful in this field. And I cannot see how an agreement could be worked out unless, at the same time, it is recognized that there has to be some form of agreement with the Red Chinese; otherwise there never could be meaningful inspection. Is that the way you see it?

Mr. BOWLES: That is the way I see it.

—Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jan. 19

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Norman Thomas Appeals to Kennedy to Correct Dangerous Leak on Nuclear Test Talks

Scientist of Remarkable Detachment Named Chairman of AEC

A driving ambition and an extraordinary political discretion characterize Kennedy's nominee for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, a Nobel laureate in chemistry, managed to spend the exciting years since the war in Berkeley, first in the Radiation Laboratory and then as Chancellor of the University of California, without once taking a position on the fallout and testing controversies. Dr. Seaborg lived in an atmosphere of scientific crusading, closely associated with the late Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence and Dr. Edward Teller, both campaigners for continued testing, but "was very careful," as one scientist told us, "not to take a position on anything." Dr. Seaborg is described as one of those personally benevolent scientists who could work on a new medicine or a new explosive with equal devotion, sealed off by the pure fascinations of the problem from disturbing concern with its ultimate human consequences. We understand the position was first offered to James Fisk and then Gordon Clapp but not to Henry D. Smyth of Princeton, who combines intellectual distinction and rich nuclear experience with broader human horizons. It will be interesting to see whether the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy succeeds in drawing Dr. Seaborg out on the many controversial issues of public policy on which he will have to pass. There is talk of adding a biologist to the AEC, perhaps Paul Doty of Harvard.

A Leak From The Pentagon?

That alarmist story, "Kennedy Aides Ask Delay in Nuclear Test Ban Talks" (*New York Times,* Jan. 15), which drew an open letter of protest to Kennedy from Norman Thomas for the National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy, seems to have been a distorted leak from someone in the Pentagon to Times-man, Jack Raymond. From several sources in close touch with this so-called task force report on disarmament, I gathered that the report did not suggest a six months delay in the nuclear test talks, as reported by the Times, but only a postponement until March instead of opening them as scheduled on Feb. 7. Several of those named as part of this task force disclaim any connection with it except insofar as they were asked to comment on drafts submitted by Jerome Spingarn of the National Planning Association, who acted as secretary.

Too Much Interest in Disarmament?

"Jerome Wiesner, of MIT, for several years Kennedy's closest science adviser, was chosen as special assistant for science and technology. Wiesner had been assumed to be in line for the post, but what seemed to be a long delay in announcing the appointment had caused speculation perhaps it would go to someone else.

"A fairly reliable source says that Wiesner himself was reluctant to take the job, on the grounds that he would have preferred to devote his full time to problems relating to disarmament. The same source reports there has been lobbying against Wiesner's appointment from within the Defense Department—on the grounds that he was too much interested in disarmament."

—Science, Jan. 20

Most of those named in the *Times* as members of the task force are cold warriors with little interest in disarmament. One of them is Paul H. Nitze, who has gone to the Pentagon as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs with special responsibility in the disarmament field. Mr. Thomas said the story seemed designed to give the impression that the ending of nuclear tests "is of comparative indifference to advisers in your new Administration. We are sure," he added, in his letter to Kennedy, "that this was not your intent and that as soon as possible you will make that fact clear."

The story in the *Times* admitted that the supposed recommendations of the task force report "appeared to conflict" with the new Secretary of State's declaration to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the new Administration expected to move promptly on test negotiations. "However," the story added poisonously, "it is understood that in thorough briefings by the outgoing State Department officials Mr. Rusk and his associates have been told that the Russians seem to be losing interest in the negotiations at Geneva on banning nuclear tests." This may be the trick of attributing one's own feelings to the other side.

Make Friends and Influence People With A Gift Sub to The Weekly — Use the Blank Below

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

1/30/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED